

LOCALIZATION OF ENERGY IN GENERAL RELATIVITY

José W. Maluf*

International Centre of Condensed Matter Physics

Universidade de Brasília

C.P. 04667

70.910-900 Brasília DF

Brazil

Abstract

In the framework of the teleparallel equivalent of general relativity the energy density ε_g of asymptotically flat gravitational fields can be naturally and unambiguously defined. Upon integration of ε_g over the whole three dimensional space we obtain the ADM energy. We use ε_g to calculate the energy inside a Schwarzschild black hole.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Fy

(*) e-mail: wadih@fis.unb.br

The definition of localized energy density is a longstanding problem in the theory of general relativity[1]. The variation of the Lagrangian density with respect to the metric field yields the energy-momentum tensor of the standard field theories. It is well known that this procedure cannot be satisfactorily applied to the Hilbert-Einstein action. Usually it is asserted on the basis of the principle of equivalence that the gravitational energy cannot be localized[2]. The principle of equivalence is frequently invoked to assure that the gravitational field can be made to vanish in a sufficiently small region of the spacetime: the dynamics of a system under the action of a gravitational field in a locally inertial frame remains unchanged if we eliminate the gravitational field but consider instead an appropriate non-inertial frame. For this reason there have been attempts to define *quasi-local* energy in general relativity (see ref.[3] and references therein).

The status of the principle of equivalence in the formulation of general relativity, as a basic principle of the theory, is, to some extent, controversial (see the discussion in the Preface of Synge's book[4]). *Einstein's* principle of equivalence[5] establishes an equivalence between inertial and non-inertial *reference frames*, from what follows the equality between inertial and gravitational masses, and ultimately the prescription according to which the gravitational field couples in the same way with the other fields and matter systems in nature (considering, of course, the different couplings between gravity and boson and fermion fields). However, the symmetry group in general relativity is the group of transformation of coordinates, and a coordinate transformation can have no effect on the presence or absence of a gravitational field. It is precisely the requirement of invariance under general coordinate transformations that leads to the Einstein tensor. Cartan[6] proved that the most general second rank tensor (i) constructed in a coordinate independent way from the metric tensor and its first and second partial derivatives, (ii) having a vanishing divergence, and (iii) linear in the second derivatives is Einstein

tensor (Lovelock[7] showed that one can dispense with (iii)). From the mathematical point of view Einstein's principle of equivalence plays no role in the determination of the gravitational field equations in vacuo.

Therefore the principle of equivalence cannot be taken to rule out the existence of an expression for the gravitational energy density. The absence of the latter in the literature is really due to the description of the gravitational field in terms of the Hilbert-Einstein action integral, which is not an appropriate framework for such considerations.

In this paper we will show that in the context of the teleparallel equivalent of general relativity (TEGR) there is a natural and simple definition of energy density of the gravitational field for asymptotically flat spacetimes. This expression is first noticed in the Hamiltonian formulation of the TEGR; specifically, it arises in the integral form of the Hamiltonian constraint. However, it also appears as a surface term in the total Hamiltonian of the TEGR, and therefore it has a canonical significance.

Notation: spacetime indices $\mu, \nu, \dots$ and local Lorentz indices $a, b, \dots$ run from 0 to 3. In the 3+1 decomposition latin indices from the middle of the alphabet indicate space indices, according to $\mu = 0, i, a = (0), (i)$. The tetrad field $e^a{}_\mu$ and the (arbitrary) spin affine connection $\omega_{\mu ab}$ yield the usual definitions of the torsion and curvature tensors: $R^a{}_{b\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu{}^a{}_b + \omega_\mu{}^a{}_c \omega_\nu{}^c{}_b - \dots$, $T^a{}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu e^a{}_\nu + \omega_\mu{}^a{}_b e^b{}_\nu - \dots$. The flat spacetime metric is fixed by $\eta_{(0)(0)} = -1$.

Let us briefly recall the TEGR[8]. The Lagrangian density in empty spacetime is given by

$$L(e, \omega, \lambda) = -ke\Sigma^{abc}T_{abc} + e\lambda^{ab\mu\nu}R_{ab\mu\nu}(\omega). \quad (1)$$

The constant k equals $\frac{1}{16\pi G}$, where G is the gravitational constant; $e = \det(e^a{}_\mu)$ and $\{\lambda^{ab\mu\nu}\}$ are Lagrange multipliers. The tensor Σ^{abc} is defined as

$$\Sigma^{abc} = \frac{1}{4}(T^{abc} + T^{bac} - T^{cab}) + \frac{1}{2}(\eta^{ac}T^b - \eta^{ab}T^c) ,$$

which yields

$$\Sigma^{abc}T_{abc} = \frac{1}{4}T^{abc}T_{abc} + \frac{1}{2}T^{abc}T_{bac} - T^aT_a ,$$

where $T_a = T^b{}_{ba}$.

The affine connection $\omega_{\mu ab}$ can be (identically) rewritten as $\omega_{\mu ab} = {}^o\omega_{\mu ab} + K_{\mu ab}$, where ${}^o\omega_{\mu ab}$ is the Levi-Civita connection and $K_{\mu ab} = \frac{1}{2}e_a{}^\lambda e_b{}^\nu (T_{\lambda\mu\nu} + T_{\nu\lambda\mu} - T_{\mu\nu\lambda})$ is the contortion tensor. Such decomposition of $\omega_{\mu ab}$ allows us to obtain the identity

$$eR(e, \omega) = eR(e) + e\Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu}T_{\alpha\mu\nu} - 2\partial_\mu(eT^\mu) , \quad (2)$$

by just substituting $\omega_{\mu ab}$ for ${}^o\omega_{\mu ab} + K_{\mu ab}$ on the left hand side (LHS) of (2). We observe that the vanishing of $R^a{}_{b\mu\nu}(\omega)$ implies the equivalence of the scalar curvature $R(e)$ - constructed out of $e^a{}_\mu$ only - and the quadratic combination of the torsion tensor (for asymptotically flat spacetimes the divergence in (2) does not contribute to the action integral).

Except for the presence of $-k$ in (1), the Lagrangian density considered here is the same as in ref.[8]. Variation of L with respect to $\lambda^{ab\mu\nu}$ yields

$$R^a{}_{b\mu\nu}(\omega) = 0 . \quad (3)$$

Let $\frac{\delta L}{\delta e^{a\mu}} = 0$ denote the field equation satisfied by $e^a{}_\mu$. With the help of (3) it can be shown by explicit calculations that

$$\frac{\delta L}{\delta e^{a\mu}} = \frac{1}{2}\{R_{a\mu}(e) - \frac{1}{2}e_{a\mu}R(e)\} , \quad (4)$$

again by replacing $\omega_{\mu ab}$ for ${}^o\omega_{\mu ab}(e) + K_{\mu ab}$ in the LHS of (4). Therefore $e^a{}_\mu$ does satisfy Einstein's equations.

The field equations arising from variations of L with respect to $\omega_{\mu ab}$ can be best analysed in the Hamiltonian formulation. The latter has been presented in ref.[8], with the gauge $\omega_{0ab} = 0$ being fixed from the outset. In this paper we will likewise maintain this gauge fixing, as it can be shown that in this restricted context the constraints of the theory constitute a first class set. The condition $\omega_{0ab} = 0$ is fixed by breaking the local Lorentz symmetry of (1). We still make use of the residual time independent gauge symmetry to fix the usual time gauge condition $e_{(k)}{}^0 = e_{(0)i} = 0$.

The Hamiltonian density H can be successfully constructed out of (1) in terms of canonical field variables and Lagrange multipliers. Because of the gauge fixing $\omega_{0ab} = 0$, H does not depend on P^{kab} , the momentum canonically conjugated to ω_{kab} . Thus arbitrary variations of $L = p\dot{q} - H$ with respect to P^{kab} yields $\dot{\omega}_{kab} = 0$ (see expression (21) of the Lagrangian density in [8]; had we not fixed $\omega_{0ab} = 0$ the corresponding equation would be $\dot{\omega}_{kab} - D_k\omega_{0ab} = 0$, which is equivalent to the Lagrangian field equation $R_{ab0k} = 0$). Therefore in view of $\omega_{0ab} = 0$, ω_{kab} drops out from our considerations. The above gauge fixing can be understood as the fixation of a *global* reference frame.

The details of the 3+1 decomposition of (1) are given in [8], except that the surface terms in eq. (6) below were not considered in the latter. The canonical action integral becomes

$$A_{TL} = \int d^4x \{ \Pi^{(j)k} \dot{e}_{(j)k} - H \} , \quad (5)$$

$$H = NC + N^i C_i + \Sigma_{mn} \Pi^{[mn]} + \frac{1}{8\pi G} \partial_k (NeT^k) + \partial_k (\Pi^{jk} N_j) . \quad (6)$$

N and N^i are the lapse and shift functions, and $\Sigma_{mn} = -\Sigma_{nm}$ are Lagrange multipliers.

The constraints are defined by

$$C = \partial_j(2keT^j) - ke\Sigma^{kij}T_{kij} - \frac{1}{4ke}(\Pi^{ij}\Pi_{ji} - \frac{1}{2}\Pi^2), \quad (7)$$

$$C_k = -e_{(j)k}\partial_i\Pi^{(j)i} - \Pi^{(j)i}T_{(j)ik}, \quad (8)$$

with $e = \det(e_{(j)k})$ and $T^i = g^{ik}e^{(j)l}T_{(j)lk}$. We remark that (5) is invariant under global SO(3) and general coordinate transformations. An important feature of this framework is that although we are considering asymptotically flat gravitational fields, the action integral determined by (1) does *not* require any additional surface term, as it is invariant under coordinate transformations that preserve the asymptotic structure of the field quantities. A clear discussion concerning the necessity of the addition of a surface term to the Hilbert-Einstein action A_{HE} , in the case of asymptotically flat gravitational fields, is given by Faddeev[9].

We consider now that for $r \rightarrow \infty$ we have $e_{(j)k} \approx \eta_{jk} + \frac{1}{2}h_{jk}(\frac{1}{r})$. In view of the relation

$$\frac{1}{8\pi G} \int d^3x \partial_j(eT^j) = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int_S dS_k (\partial_i h_{ik} - \partial_k h_{ii}) \equiv E_{ADM}, \quad (9)$$

where the surface integral is evaluated for $r \rightarrow \infty$, we observe that the integral form of the Hamiltonian constraint $C = 0$ may be rewritten as

$$\int d^3x \left\{ ke\Sigma^{kij}T_{kij} + \frac{1}{4ke}(\Pi^{ij}\Pi_{ji} - \frac{1}{2}\Pi^2) \right\} = E_{ADM}; \quad (10)$$

the integration is over the whole three dimensional space. Since $\partial_j(eT^j)$ is a scalar density, from (9) and (10) we are naturally led to define the gravitational energy enclosed by a volume V of the space as

$$E_g = \frac{1}{8\pi G} \int_V d^3x \partial_j (e T^j) . \quad (11)$$

The expression above is manifestly invariant under general coordinate transformations of the three dimensional space-like hypersurface Σ and yields E_{ADM} if the integration is over the whole Σ .

Let us note from (6) that $\int d^3x H$ evaluated from a set $(e_{(j)k}, \Pi^{(k)l})$ that satisfy the field equations, in a coordinate system such that for $r \rightarrow \infty$ we have $N = 1$, $N_j = 0$, also yields E_{ADM} .

The appearance of a scalar and vector densities in (6) is intimately related to the fact that it is not necessary to add a non-covariant surface term to (1). The surface term that must be added to the Hilbert-Einstein action is not well behaved under coordinate transformations, but as Faddeev stressed, the action integral is invariant[9]. Since it is precisely this surface term that leads to E_{ADM} , it is not possible to obtain a satisfactory energy density out of A_{HE} .

A similar difficulty occurs in the context of the Einstein-Cartan formulation. The Lagrangian density for asymptotically flat gravitational fields in the first order differential formulation is given by

$$L_{EC} = e e^{a\mu} e^{b\nu} R_{ab\mu\nu}(\omega) - 2\partial_\mu (e e^{a\mu} e^{b\nu} \omega_{\nu ab}) . \quad (12)$$

After performing a canonical 3+1 decomposition of L_{EC} , the Hamiltonian density acquires a surface term which reads[10]

$$\varepsilon_{EC} = \partial_i (2N e e^{ai} e^{bj} \omega_{jab} - N^j e^{ai} \Pi_{aj}) . \quad (12)$$

In the appropriate limit $\int d^3x \varepsilon_{EC}$ yields E_{ADM} , but no energy density can be defined from

(11).

The gravitational energy-momentum four-vector of theories with local gauge symmetry has already been discussed in the literature, in the context of Poincaré gauge theories[11]. Such analyses are always carried out in the Lagrangian framework, and can equally well be applied to the TEGR. We note, however, that the present considerations are derived from the Hamiltonian formulation. To our knowledge, the appearance of the ADM energy in the Hamiltonian constraint has not been previously noticed.

Brown and York[3] have recently furnished an expression of quasilocal gravitational energy density for compact geometries, by resorting to a Hamilton-Jacobi-type analysis. They consider the action integral evaluated from field quantities that solve the classical equations of motion, and as a function of the time interval. Then the action A satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation $E = -\frac{\partial A}{\partial T}$, where E expresses the energy of the classical solution. In analogy with this procedure they define the quasilocal energy associated with a space-like hypersurface Σ as minus the variation of the action with respect to a unit increase in proper time separation between the boundary B of Σ and its neighboring two-surface, as measured orthogonally to Σ at B . In the present case we can similarly define the energy density as minus the variation of the action with respect to the proper time $N(x)$. For a given set of solutions of the classical equations of motion the energy density ε_g can be defined as

$$\varepsilon_g(x) = -\frac{\delta A_{TL}}{\delta N(x)} = \frac{1}{8\pi G} \partial_j (e T^j) , \quad (14)$$

in agreement with (11).

The fixation of the time gauge condition prevents the construction of a global $SO(3,1)$ energy-momentum four vector P^a , because the space and time components of P^a can no longer be mixed. Nevertheless we can identify the components of such a vector. The

field quantities $\{\Pi^{ak}\}$ are defined by $\Pi^{ak} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{e}_{ak}}$. $\Pi^{(j)k}$ is the true momentum canonically conjugated to $e_{(j)k}$. However, because of the time gauge condition, in the 3+1 decomposition $\Pi^{(0)k}$ must be expressed in terms of canonical field variables. One ultimately finds $\Pi^{(0)k} = 2eT^k$ (see the discussion following eq. (19) of [8]).

We assume now that $e_{(j)k}$ and $\Pi^{(j)k}$ satisfy the constraints. From $C_i = 0$ we obtain

$$\partial_i \Pi^{(m)i} = -e^{(m)k} \Pi^{(j)i} T_{(j)ik} . \quad (15)$$

Therefore we define the energy-momentum quadruplet P^a as

$$P^a = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \partial_k \Pi^{ak} . \quad (16)$$

Since the constraints are satisfied we have

$$P^{(0)} = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \partial_j (eT^j) = \frac{1}{4ke} (\Pi^{ij} \Pi_{ji} - \frac{1}{2} \Pi^2) + ke \Sigma^{kij} T_{kij} , \quad (17)$$

$$P^{(m)} = -\frac{1}{16\pi G} e^{(m)k} \Pi^{(j)i} T_{(j)ik} . \quad (18)$$

In the following we will specialize the Hamiltonian formulation to the spherically symmetric geometry, in order to compute the gravitational energy inside a Schwarzschild black hole. We fix the triads $e_{(k)i}$ as

$$e_{(k)i} = \begin{pmatrix} e^\lambda \sin\theta \cos\phi & r \cos\theta \cos\phi & -r \sin\theta \sin\phi \\ e^\lambda \sin\theta \sin\phi & r \cos\theta \sin\phi & r \sin\theta \cos\phi \\ e^\lambda \cos\theta & -r \sin\theta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

where $\lambda = \lambda(r, t)$; (k) is the line index and i is the column index. The one form $e^{(k)}$ is defined as

$$e^{(k)} = e^{(k)}_r dr + e^{(k)}_\theta d\theta + e^{(k)}_\phi d\phi ,$$

from what follows

$$e^{(k)} e_{(k)} = e^{2\lambda} dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 .$$

We also obtain $e = \det(e_{(k)i}) = r^2 \sin \theta e^\lambda$. For $r \rightarrow \infty$ we require $\lambda(r) \sim O(\frac{1}{r})$.

The symmetry reduction is performed directly in the Hamiltonian. We first determine the Killing vectors ξ of $g_{ij} = e^{(k)}_i e_{(k)j}$. Next we require the vanishing of the Lie derivative $L_\xi(e^{-1}\Pi_{ij}) = 0$, where $\Pi_{ij} = g_{jk} e_{(l)i} \Pi^{(l)k}$. We obtain

$$e^{-1}\Pi_{ij} = \text{diag}(A(r, t), B(r, t), B(r, t) \sin^2 \theta) ; \quad (20)$$

$A(r, t)$ and $B(r, t)$ are arbitrary functions. From (20) we can calculate all $\{\Pi^{(k)j}\}$. Upon substitution of the latter and (19) into (5) we find out, as expected, that there is no canonical field quantity conjugated to $B(r, t)$. Thus we enforce $B(r, t) = 0$, which implies in $\Pi^{(k)2} = \Pi^{(k)3} = 0$. Defining Π by $\Pi = kr^2 e^{-\lambda} A$ and integrating over angles we finally obtain the action integral

$$A = 4\pi \int dt dr \{ \Pi \dot{\lambda} - NC - N^1 C_1 \} , \quad (21)$$

$$C = 2ke^\lambda (1 - e^{-\lambda})^2 - \frac{1}{8kr^2} e^{-\lambda} \Pi^2 + \frac{1}{4\pi} \varepsilon , \quad (22)$$

$$C_1 = -e^\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (e^{-\lambda} \Pi) , \quad (23)$$

$$\varepsilon = 16\pi k \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [r(1 - e^{-\lambda})] , \quad (24)$$

The constraints $C_2 = C_\theta$ and $C_3 = C_\phi$ vanish identically.

The Hamiltonian formulation established by (21-24) is completely equivalent to the corresponding construction in the framework of the ADM formulation[12], as it can be shown that the Hamiltonian and vector constraints are equivalent in both cases. If we choose a coordinate system such that $N^1 = 0$, then the constraints and the evolution equations for λ and Π yield the Schwarzschild solution,

$$e^{-2\lambda} = 1 - \frac{2mG}{r}, \quad (25)$$

together with $N^2 = e^{-2\lambda}$.

The total energy associated with (25) may be calculated from the surface term (24). In analogy with (9) we obtain, as expected,

$$E_{ADM} = \int^\infty dr \varepsilon_g(r) = m. \quad (26)$$

We can also compute exactly the gravitational energy inside a black hole. It is given by

$$E_{BH} = \int_0^{2mG} dr \varepsilon_g(r) = 2m, \quad (27)$$

which implies that the total energy exterior to the black hole is $-m$.

It is of interest to evaluate, in addition, the the gravitational energy inside a spherical surface of arbitrary radius R :

$$E_g = R \left\{ 1 - \left(1 - \frac{2m}{R} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

This is exactly the expression found by Brown and York[3] in their analysis of *quasilocal* gravitational energy of the Schwarzschild solution. The method developed by Brown and York, however, does not seem to be applicable to an arbitrary metric field. Problems

appear in the calculation of the quasilocal energy in the framework of the Kerr metric[13]. On the contrary, given the triad components restricted to a three dimensional hypersurface of the Kerr type we can easily calculate E_g by means of (14).

In conclusion, we find out that in the TEGR there is a natural, consistent and unambiguous definition of gravitational energy density. This fact indicates that this framework is suitable for the Hamiltonian analysis of the gravitational field. In particular, the integral form of the Hamiltonian constraint, eq.(10), may become an energy eigenvalue equation in the canonical quantization program.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by CNPQ.

References

- [1] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980), sec. 96; A. Komar, Phys.Rev. **113**, 934 (1959); **127**, 1411 (1962); **129**, 1873 (1963); R. Penrose, Proc. R. Soc. London **A381**, 53 (1982); in *Asymptotic Behaviour of Mass and Spacetime Geometry*, edited by F. J. Flaherty (Springer, Berlin, 1984)
- [2] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973)
- [3] J. David Brown and J. W. York, Jr, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1407 (1993)

- [4] J. L. Synge, *Relativity: The General Theory* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1960)
- [5] J. Norton, Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. **16**, 203 (1985)
- [6] E. Cartan, J. Math. Pure Appl. **1**, 141 (1922)
- [7] D. Lovelock, J. Math. Phys. **12**, 498 (1971)
- [8] J. W. Maluf, J. Math. Phys., **35**, 335 (1994)
- [9] L. D. Faddeev, Sov. Phys. Usp. **25**, 130 (1982)
- [10] J. W. Maluf, Class. Quantum Grav. **8**, 287 (1991)
- [11] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, Prog. Theor. Phys. **73**, 54 (1985); P. Baeckler, R. Hecht, F. W. Hehl and T. Shirafuji, Prog. Theor. Phys. **78**, 16 (1987); E. W. Mielke and R. P. Wallner, Il Nuovo Cimento **101B**, 607 (1988)
- [12] B. K. Berger, D. M. Chitre, V. E. Moncrief and Y. Nutku, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 2467 (1972); W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 870 (1976); F. Lund, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 3247 (1973)
- [13] E. A. Martinez, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 4290 (1994).